IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE NASHVILLE DIVISION

11-1085

ORDER

Pursuant to the order entered September 6, 2012 (Docket Entry No. 45), counsel for the parties called the Court on September 14, 2012, at which time they advised that the defendant had provided plaintiffs' counsel with the data addressed in the September 6, 2012, order, although there appeared to be some missing data. Plaintiffs' counsel extrapolated from the data provided and made a settlement demand, to which the defendant intends to respond, after locating any missing data and checking the figures. Defendants' counsel also expressed a desire to complete a round of negotiations before scheduling any ADR. The Court agrees with the defendants' position and encourages the parties to engage in settlement discussions themselves to the extent possible and to determine whether they can resolve the case without the assistance of formal ADR.

Counsel for the parties shall convene another telephone conference call with the Court on **Tuesday, September 25, 2012, at 10:00 a.m.,** to be initiated by defendant's counsel, to address the potential for settlement and propriety of ADR, whether any scheduling deadlines need to be or can be extended, and any other appropriate matters.

It is so ORDERED.

JULIET GRIFFIN United States Magistrate Judge

¹ By proposed agreed order filed on January 27, 2012 (Docket Entry No. 18), and order entered February 3, 23012 (Docket Entry No. 20), Diversicare Leasing Corp. was substituted for DiversiCare Management Services Co., originally named in the complaint, and DiversiCare Management Services Co. was terminated as a defendant.